

## REMARKS

Claims 61-63, 65-70, 72-77, and 79-81 were pending in this application.

Claims 61-63, 65-70, 72-77, and 79-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Humpleman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,288,716 ("Humpleman").

### Summary of Applicants Reply

Applicants have amended claims 61, 65, 68, 72, 75, and 79 to more particularly define the invention. No new matter has been added by the amendments and the amendments are fully supported by the original specification. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, on page 34, lines 12-34 of the original specification.

### Summary of Telephonic Interview

The Examiner and applicants' representative, Michael J. Chasan (Reg. No. 54,026), conducted a telephonic interview on January 9, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner and applicants' representative discussed the claims and the cited references. In particular, the lack of any disclosure in Humpleman that shows selecting a template document based on a user access device type was discussed. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection in view of this Reply to Office Action. Applicants and applicants' representative wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during this interview.

### Applicants' Reply to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Applicants' amended independent claims 61, 68, and 75 are directed toward methods and systems for generating a virtual representation of one of a plurality of devices for a remote user access device using a template document. Each of

the plurality of devices are associated with respective display components. Each of a plurality of user access device types are associated with respective template documents. The template documents contain a layout specifying an arrangement of display components and support the plurality of devices. The remote user access type is determined and a template document associated with the determined user access type is selected. At least one display component is retrieved for the device and inserted into the selected template document. Finally, the virtual representation for the device is generated using the selected template document.

Humpleman refers to a system in which "each home device sends its own custom GUI" to the display device. (Humpleman, column 7, lines 14-15). Thus, rather than using a template document, that support a plurality of devices with respective display components to generate virtual representations containing device display components, as recited by applicants' independent claims, Humpleman only uses individual custom GUIs for each device.

Furthermore, there is nothing in Humpleman that refers to "associating each of a plurality of user access device types with respective template documents" or "selecting a template document associated with the determined user access device type," as recited by applicants' amended independent claims. Contrary to the Examiner's contention, Humpleman does not show either associating user access device types with template documents or selecting template documents associated with a user access device types. In fact, Humpleman only refers to a single user access device type, namely a personal computer. Therefore Humpleman cannot show associating a plurality of user access device types with template documents. Furthermore because in Humpleman only one GUI is provided by each home device, there is no detection of a user access

device type nor is there selection of a template document associated with a detected user access device type.

Accordingly, Humpleman does not show all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims. For at least this reason, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended independent claims 61, 68, and 75 be withdrawn. Claims 62, 63, 65-67, 69, 70, 72-74, 76, 77, and 79-81 depend from of amended independent claims 61, 68, and 75, respectively. For at least this reason, applicants also respectfully request that the rejection of 62, 63, 65-67, 69, 70, 72-74, 76, 77, and 79-81 be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that this application, including claims 61-63, 65-67, 68-70, 72-74, 75-77, and 79-81, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Chasan/  
Michael J. Chasan  
Registration No. 54,026  
Agent for Applicants

ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000